DISPATCH

CLASSIFICATION: CONFIDENTIAL

PROCESSING ACTION: MARKED FOR INDEXING / NO INDEXING REQUIRED / ONLY QUALIFIED DESK CODE TO INDEXING / MICROFILM

TO : Chief of Station, [redacted] 25X1A

INFO. : Chief, Far East Division
Chief of Base, [redacted] Director of Logistics 25X1A

FROM : Chief of Station, [redacted] 25X1A

SUBJECT : Engineering/Support - Report of Inspection, Conclusion and Recommendations

ACTION REQUIRED - REFERENCES [redacted] 25X1A

REFERENCES: A. [redacted] (Not Sent DIR, IGIS)
25X1A B. [redacted] (Not Sent Dir, IGIS)

1. Inspection requested by Ref A prompted by Ref B was performed by the writer during the period 28-30 April 1964. Report follows.

25X1A 2. [redacted] reported a total rainfall during April 7.8 inches with 3.0 inches during the 10-16 April period. The rainy period occurred simultaneously with ground thawing. It is evident that the entire area where fill material was placed in order to elevate the wall sufficiently to obscure buildings was thoroughly saturated by these April rains. Consolidation of this soil mass, which appears to be a uniform mixture of granular and cohesive soils, and resulting settlement is evidenced by small cracks in the soil surface and subsidence of soil adjacent to concrete posts and grade beams. At no point along the 286 lineal feet of wall effected was there a mass fall-off of soil away from the wall nor was there evidence of severe surface erosion due to fast run off of water. Because the mass of fill was not stabilized except that portion directly beneath the wall footings, consolidation has caused both settlement and lateral movement of the mass. Some evidence of this lateral shift can be seen in the photos attached to this report. The 10" square concrete posts and 10" deep grade beams have been subjected also to unbalanced side forces tending to tilt the wall in the downhill direction except for one 30' section which tilts opposite due to opposite forces. It is noted that a surface inlet for a storm drain is inside the perimeter wall at this point and finish grade drops off quite rapidly from wall to inlet which

Attachment:
4 - Photos

Distribution:
Orig. & 1 - [redacted] w/att. 25X1A
1- Chief, FE wo/att.
1 - Director of Logistics wo/att.
25X1A 1 - [redacted] wo/att.

CROSS REFERENCE TO: 25X1A

DISPATCH SYMBOL AND NUMBER: [redacted]

DATE: 14 MAY 1964 — 11 May 1964

CLASSIFICATION: CONFIDENTIAL

HQS FILE NUMBER:

25X1A

1 - Reg
1 - FE Eng

ORIGINATING

OFFICE	OFFICER	TYPIST	EXT.
FE ENG	[redacted]	gb	485

COORDINATING

OFFICE SYMBOL	DATE	OFFICER'S NAME

RELEASING

OFFICE SYMBOL	DATE	OFFICER'S SIGNATURE
DCOS		[redacted] 25X1A

FORM 1-63 53 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS (40)

DISPATCH

 25X1A

was installed approximately 20" from the wall. Tilting of the 146'-0" length of wall is visible on one photo. The post having the greatest tilt is over an area of maximum fill depth and measurement taken 29 April showed it 3 1/4" out at the top. Two interior corner posts in the 286' length of wall being braced by adjacent wall panels remain straight but a total of 27 line posts are tilting at varying degrees.

3. Conclusions:

A. One opening in wall near front gate draws attention to the fact that the wall is shifting and tilting and has created a disturbing atmosphere at the site resulting in unnecessary concern and conjecture as to when the wall will topple. Although the wall will continue to suffer adverse effects due to some additional consolidation of the fill material supporting it these further effects will be slow in developing. No immediate danger exists therefore to personnel or equipment since wall tilt is far from that required for toppling due to wind and gravitational forces.

B. Design deficiencies are apparent in that the reinforced concrete posts are all the same length and designed for natural undisturbed soil conditions. At least 29 posts should have been 2 to 3 feet longer to reach undisturbed soil. An alternate design incorporating a reinforced concrete bond beam at the top of the wall which would tie the posts together could have been used but at greater construction cost.

C. A construction deficiency exists also because [redacted] soil compaction methods do not achieve specifications requirements for 95% maximum density at optimum moisture content. Had the fill beneath the structure (wall) been compacted to meet specifications the effects of soil consolidation and settlement would not have occurred as rapidly as actually happened nor would long term effects been as severe. It is believed, however, that stabilization of the entire bank of fill would have been required in addition to proper compaction under the footings to preclude lateral and tilting movements. 25X1

D. Apparently there is no recourse possible in this case due to approval of the design, inspection by Title II contractor who stated via telephone to the writer that contractor performance was very satisfactory, and completed facility was accepted by all parties.

4. Recommendations:

A. One additional 8" storm drain be installed with inlet north of overhead fuel tank.

B. Chief of [redacted] obtain suitable strip of material and install over crack that is opening in front wall so that the eyes of visitors are not attracted by the light shining through a crack in the wall. Unnecessary questions may be avoided if the crack is concealed from sight outside. 25X1A

25X1A C. Regular inspections and measurements be taken by Chief, [redacted] weekly with bi-weekly photos similar to those taken 30 April 1964.

25X1

D. 286 lineal feet of perimeter wall be removed except for two interior corner posts and rebuilt.using new and longer monolithically cast posts and salvaged block and reinforcing steel supplemented by new materials as required. Longer posts to be set on undisturbed soil beneath fill with well compacted soil fill and gravel fill between posts as originally designed.

25X1A E. Funds be authorized through previously established channels in the amount of $1800. Original bid proposal forms prepared by [redacted] showed costs totalling $7,440 for 1620 feet of wall or approximately $5.00 per lineal foot. 25X1A

5. Upon concurrence with the above conclusions and recommendations it is proposed that the F.E. Area Engineer Office will draw revised detailed sketches

[redacted]

25X1A

[redacted]